

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAY 30 2008

## REMARKS

### Claim Status

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 are pending in the present application.

### Rejections Under 35 USC §102(e)

Pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action indicate that "*Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Bristor*". The rejection does not provide a patent number or patent publication number for the Bristor reference cited by the Examiner. In order for Applicants to fully argue the rejection, Applicants respectfully request clarification as to what patent number/patent application number is associated with the Examiner's citation of the Bristor reference in this rejection.

Page 4 of the Office Action indicates that "*Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Barger et al.*" The rejection does not provide a patent number or patent publication number for the Barger reference cited by the Examiner. In order for Applicants to fully argue the rejection, Applicants respectfully request clarification as to what patent number/patent publication number is associated with the Examiner's citation of the Barger et al. reference in this rejection.

### Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Page 5 of the Office Action indicates that Claim 3 is rejected "*under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bristor in view of Lee*". The rejection does not provide a patent number or patent publication number for either the Bristor reference or the Lee reference cited by the Examiner. In order for Applicants to fully argue this rejection, Applicants respectfully request clarification as to what patent number/patent application number is associated with the Examiner's citation of the Bristor reference and the Lee reference in this rejection.

Pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action indicate that "*Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bristor*". The rejection does not provide a patent number or patent publication number for the Bristor reference cited by the Examiner. In order for Applicants to fully argue this rejection, Applicants respectfully request clarification as to what

patent number/patent application number is associated with the Examiner's citation of the Bristor reference in this rejection.

Page 6 of the Office Action indicates that "*Claims 1, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bristor in view of Simonetti.*" The rejection does not provide a patent number or patent publication number for the Bristor reference cited by the Examiner. In order for Applicants to fully argue this rejection, Applicants respectfully request clarification as to what patent number/patent application number is associated with the Examiner's citation of the Bristor reference and the Simonetti reference.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 30 2008

## SUMMARY

The references cited in the Claim rejections made by the Examiner in the January 30, 2008 Office Action did not include patent numbers or patent publication numbers. Applicants respectfully request clarification from the Examiner as to which patent numbers/patent publication numbers are associated with each reference cited in the rejections so that Applicants may fully respond to the Examiner's arguments.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER &amp; GAMBLE COMPANY

By

  
Julia A. Glazer

Registration No.: 41,783

(513) 627 - 4132

Dated: May 30, 2008

Customer No. 27752